

Date: Sun, 23 Oct 94 04:30:17 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: List  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #501  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sun, 23 Oct 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 501

Today's Topics:

                    CW QSO Content (4 msgs)  
            NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLETins (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: 22 Oct 94 22:57:47 GMT  
From: William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.rockwell.COM  
Subject: CW QSO Content

>There is no such thing as the First Class Radiotelephone License,  
>so therefore licensees holding an invalid certificate pose no  
>problem for the Commission.

semantics. there is a general radiotelephone license. anyone that had the  
first phone from before now has a general...but those that had the first phone  
do treasure those licenses...and people in the biz still talk like the 1st 2nd  
and 3rd exist..even tho we all know there's a restricted radiotelephone and a  
general radiotelephone license....

>It requires effort. Memorizing a question pool requires none, however.

get the feeling you are either unlicensed or it's been quite a long time since  
you've looked at test materials. if it's no sweat to memorize a question  
pool, how come people fail the tests and those that pass don't score 100%  
every time?

bill wb9ivr

-----  
Date: 22 Oct 1994 18:43:53 -0500  
From: mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini)  
Subject: CW QSO Content

In article <199410222303.QAA16752@ucsd.edu>,  
<William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.rockwell.COM> wrote:  
>>There is no such thing as the First Class Radiotelephone License,  
>>so therefore licensees holding an invalid certificate pose no  
>>problem for the Commission.  
>  
>semantics. there is a general radiotelephone license. anyone that had the  
>first phone from before now has a general...but those that had the first phone  
  
<sigh> Untrue, again. Issuance of the General Radiotelephone license is not  
automatic, as you claim. If you had the First Phone, you must APPLY for it,  
and I know MANY who haven't.

I suggest you go up to your local Field Office and become better educated  
on licensing procedures before you post again in this newsgroup.

-----  
Date: Sun, 23 Oct 1994 01:20:00 GMT  
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)  
Subject: CW QSO Content

William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.rockwell.COM writes:  
>(sic)  
>get the feeling you are either unlicensed or it's been quite a long time since  
>you've looked at test materials. if(sic) it's no sweat to memorize a question  
>pool, how come people fail the tests and those that pass don't score 100%  
>every time?

People fail the tests because they don't even bother to open a book  
and memorize the Q&A.

People don't get 100% because they don't memorize enough of the Q&A.

Jeff NH6IL

-----  
Date: 22 Oct 1994 22:23:01 -0400  
From: tomsunman@aol.com (TOM SUNMAN)

Subject: CW QSO Content

In article <Cy3qDC.Fxp@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

<People fail the tests because they don't even bother to open a book  
>and memorize the Q&A.

<People don't get 100% because they don't memorize enough of the Q&A.

This kills me. I'm 8 days away from taking my tech exams. I've been studying my head off, NOT MEMORIZING the question pools. How the hell is anyone going to memorize 645 questions and answers?! It's not very likely. Don't say you don't have to know all the questions because no one knows WHICH of the 645 will be on their tests. No-codes will NOT ruin amateur radio folks, the problems would be here already. I've been monitoring the 2 meter freqs for months and the techs are treated with the SAME respect as any other license. The techs respect and properly abide by the rules like everyone else. Sure, you MAY find an idiot now and then but they quickly go away and the higher class licenses can have misusers just like any other class license. Just because we don't do the code doesn't mean we'll mess up the airwaves. Also, a LOT of us WILL upgrade eventually. I plan on it. I'm not much into cw but I respect it and those who use it. Why can't YOU folks respect US?

Tom

-----  
Date: Sat, 22 Oct 1994 20:06:26 GMT  
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)  
Subject: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLetins

rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins n6fri) writes:

>This was found floating on the Amateur Packet BBS system. What do you think?

I think it's always in the benefit of the ARS when a clarification of the rules are made in advance to violation notices being handed out. All it probably took was for a few to stretch what was considered appropriate use of packet for this clarification to be made.

On the back of our license it says, in part, 'Operation of the station shall be in accordance with Part 97 of the Commission's Rules.' Our signature on the front binds us to this statement.

If someone has a problem with this 00 and this clarification, I hear that packet might now be in use on the CB frequencies....

>\*\*\* Yes, Fred, keep up the good work. I'm glad that you are doing all  
>\*\*\* that you can to make Amateur radio packet boring.  
>\*\*\* 73 George K7WWA @ K7WWA.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NOAM

Boring maybe, but legal!

Jeff NH6IL

-----  
Date: Fri, 21 Oct 94 22:06:43 -0500  
From: Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>  
Subject: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLetins

Bob Wilkins n6fri <rwilkins@ccnet.com> writes:

>1. Any packet message or bulletin sent to ANYTHING other than another  
>specific Amateur Callsign (EXCLUDING the callsign of the BBS) is  
>considered to be a "One-Way Bulletin," and as such must comply  
>with Part 97 in terms of permissible message content for such  
>bulletins. Also stated was the definition of "anything" (above),  
>which is such addressing as to ALL, ALLUS, ALLCA, Food, Drugs,  
>Guns, or anything else, other than another specific amateur  
>callsign.

>\*\*\* Yes, Fred, keep up the good work. I'm glad that you are doing all  
>  
>\*\*\* that you can to make Amateur radio packet boring.

Boring or not, everything I've seen says that Fred is right -- if the xmsn is not directed at another specific amateur, and not intended to be answered by another ham, then it's a one-way and as such can only contain material intended for licensed hams only, with only a few specified exceptions (such as code practice).

-----  
Date: Sat, 22 Oct 1994 20:47:19 GMT  
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)  
Subject: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLetins

kevin.jessup@mail.mei.com (Kevin Jessup) writes:

> Then again,  
>I'm sure we'll see Internet regulated and censored soon enough.

Our worst nightmare: The US Postal Service to run internet; 29 cents per article per recipient! This one message might ``...cost hundreds if not thousands of dollars to post to every machine ...'' [that'll sound familiar to UNIX users].

73 from Hawaii,  
Jeff NH6IL

-----  
Date: 22 Oct 1994 22:19:47 GMT  
From: mcf2@Isis.MsState.Edu (Michael C Fortner)

References<CxzKtK.7p2@srngenprp.sr.hp.com> <38bht2\$i19@Tut.MsState.Edu>,  
<1994Oct22.174717.697@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Subject: Re: ARRL salaries (Was: ARRL Dues(Or why pay em?))

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:  
: In article <38bht2\$i19@Tut.MsState.Edu> mcf2@Isis.MsState.Edu (Michael C  
Fortner) writes:  
: >Alan Bloom (alanb@hpnmarb.sr.hp.com) wrote:  
: >  
: >: A friend of mine reportedly took a \$10k per year pay cut when he quit his  
: >: job in industry and went to work for ARRL. When I worked there in the  
: >: mid-70's my starting salary was \$500/month as a W1AW operator. I have heard  
: >: ^^^  
: >Yes, but isn't that violating FCC rules. If I remember correctly, part

\*my words deleted\*

: Of course it \*isn't\* violating the rules to pay W1AW operators. That's  
: because the ARRL had the FCC write a sweetheart clause into the rules  
: allowing them to pay the the operators of their Harris commerical  
: broadcasting facility to broadcast on the amateur bands. (Like other  
: broadcasters, they never listen first either, and \*that\* is still against  
: the rules.)

So shouldn't this discussion be on rec.radio.pirate then? ;)

michael (who doesn't care that Newington views themselves as God's gift  
to ham radio.)

--

-----  
Michael C. Fortner | "He's a chicken I tell you! A GIANT CHICKEN!"

N0YBC/5 28.3800 MHz USB |-----  
mcf2@ra.msstate.edu | Finger for PGP Public Key. PGP mail Ok.  
-----

-----  
Date: Sat, 22 Oct 1994 21:09:59 GMT  
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)

References<19940ct17.130400.2817@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> <Cxu0sq.9qq@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<19940ct21.134310.22891@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Reply-To: jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu  
Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>jeffrey@The.Big.Kahuna.hey.angus.what.do.you.think.of.this.address writes:

>>Be that as it may (BTAIM?), the FCC asked us, and they heard the answer  
>>loud and clear: Keep the code. Isn't it great when the government  
>>listens to its citizens?

>No, during the code test free Tech filings, the issue of code test  
>free access to HF didn't even come up. There weren't any formal  
>comments at all on that subject. To have a chance of success, such  
>a filing must wait until we resolve the WARC issues.

I made no mention of 'formal' comments. Someone on the QRP  
newsgroup who had visited the FCC office spoke of seeing  
\*volumes\* of correspondence from hams requesting that the  
code requirements be kept.

Read the back of the 610 form concerning this.

Jeff NH6IL

-----  
Date: 22 Oct 1994 18:39:14 -0500  
From: mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini)

References<19940ct22.161441.157@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> <38boii\$4kq@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,  
<19940ct22.205345.1426@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

In article <19940ct22.205345.1426@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,  
Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> wrote:  
>In article <38boii\$4kq@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael

Mancini) writes:

>>In article <19940ct22.161441.157@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,

>>Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> wrote:

>>>In article <382a72\$ena@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini) writes:

>>>>Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> wrote:

>>>>>Excellent point. \*\*\*But how does knowledge of Morse Code have anything to do  
>>>>>with not abusing the spectrum?\*\*\*

>>>>

>>>>>Something earned through sacrifice is valued much more than something  
>>>>>unearned.

>>>>

>>>Fine. Assuming we grant you that point (but I don't) for the sake  
>>>of argument, why should that "sacrifice" be the mechanical conditioning  
>>>of the nervous system to decode manual Morse? Wouldn't a different  
>>>sacrifice be just as good, say climbing a 300 foot tower 10 times in  
>>>one day to install a packet repeater system, for example? Or digging  
>>>trenches for 120 radials? Or something else more useful to amateur  
>>>radio pursuits? Why manual Morse? Because \*you\* had to do it? Please  
>>>answer the question.

>>

>>Some people choose to work for a living, while others are satisfied  
>>living on welfare. Why do I mention this? Because I feel it demonstrates  
>>an important parallel. There are those of us who have earned our ticket  
>>through sacrifice and hard work, and now there appears to be a movement  
>>of Amateurs, Amateur-Wannabes, and Codeless Technicians who feel that  
>>the last remaining element of Amateur examinations which requires  
>>effort to pass should be eliminated. I see no need for laziness to be  
>>rewarded by the issuance of an Amateur license.

>

>Fine, blather on. NOW ANSWER THE QUESTION!

I just did, Good Buddy!

-----

Date: Sat, 22 Oct 1994 20:53:45 GMT

From: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

References<382a72\$ena@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> <19940ct22.161441.157@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,  
<38boii\$4kq@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>

Reply-To: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

In article <38boii\$4kq@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini) writes:

>In article <19940ct22.161441.157@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,

>Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> wrote:

>>In article <382a72\$ena@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini) writes:  
>>>Ed Eilers <edellers@delphi.com> wrote:  
>>>>Excellent point. \*\*\*But how does knowledge of Morse Code have anything to do  
>>>>with not abusing the spectrum?\*\*\*  
>>>  
>>>Something earned through sacrifice is valued much more than something  
>>>unearned.  
>>  
>>Fine. Assuming we grant you that point (but I don't) for the sake  
>>of argument, why should that "sacrifice" be the mechanical conditioning  
>>of the nervous system to decode manual Morse? Wouldn't a different  
>>sacrifice be just as good, say climbing a 300 foot tower 10 times in  
>>one day to install a packet repeater system, for example? Or digging  
>>trenches for 120 radials? Or something else more useful to amateur  
>>radio pursuits? Why manual Morse? Because \*you\* had to do it? Please  
>>answer the question.  
>  
>Some people choose to work for a living, while others are satisfied  
>living on welfare. Why do I mention this? Because I feel it demonstrates  
>an important parallel. There are those of us who have earned our ticket  
>through sacrifice and hard work, and now there appears to be a movement  
>of Amateurs, Amateur-Wannabes, and Codeless Technicians who feel that  
>the last remaining element of Amateur examinations which requires  
>effort to pass should be eliminated. I see no need for laziness to be  
>rewarded by the issuance of an Amateur license.

Fine, blather on. NOW ANSWER THE QUESTION!

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----

Date: 23 Oct 1994 01:12:42 GMT  
From: gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown)

References<19940ct20.120843.17532@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> <38a77c\$91i@crctis1.unl.edu>,  
<19940ct22.160445.13@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Subject: Re: Kindness and ham radio

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:

: I think gaming is harmful to the amateur service, and contrary



: to our charter to promote international goodwill. That's my  
: opinion based on 30 years experience as an amateur, and based  
: on conversations with many foreign operators (and ex-operators  
: who were driven off the bands by gamers), and I act on it  
: by not participating in gaming. I haven't proposed to ban the  
: activity, but I've reserved the right to preach against what I  
: see as bad practices. If the shoe doesn't fit you, IE you aren't  
: one of the people in it primarily to count coup, and you aren't  
: in the middle of every pileup for that "rare" one, why are you  
: complaining so loudly?

Who's complaining? I'm just pointing out how you condemn whole groups  
of people based upon your perception of how a few behave, and how  
wrong and foolish that attitude is.

: >Your repertoire seems quite limited. Sometimes, if one repeats  
: >himself enough times, people begin to believe him. Other times,  
: >people just get tired of hearing the same old stuff, and wonder why he  
: >can't find something else to say. Guess what...?

: When people pull my posts from *\*another group\** into this forum  
: in order to ask the *\*same\** question I've replied to here before,  
: it's no wonder I reply with the *\*same\** answers. I *\*am\** consistent  
: in my opinions because I believe I'm right. If that's a fault, then  
: I suppose that makes those who are wishy-washy, and change their  
: opinions like they change their underwear, faultless. If that be  
: true, then I decline to be faultless.

: Gary

Well, congratulations, Gary, you have succeeded. You are certainly  
not faultless. Anyone with such a narrow view of what is and what  
is not proper in amateur radio certainly does have a fault. Diversity  
is a strength, both within the amateur radio service and within the  
individual. You can "believe you are right" without trying to tell  
other people they are wrong. That you have had 30 years of ham radio  
to form your conclusions means nothing. My hamming started in 1962,  
and my conclusions are quite different from yours.

While we are at it, why not ease up on that self-aggrandizement? If  
someone else (besides you) would tell me how influential you have  
been in changing the whole direction of the amateur radio service and  
"dragging" it into the 20th century, I might be more prone to believe  
it.

Greg  
WB0RTK

-----  
Date: 22 Oct 1994 14:18:42 -0500  
From: mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini)

References<BayUicv.edellers@delphi.com> <382a72\$ena@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,  
<1994Oct22.161441.157@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

In article <1994Oct22.161441.157@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,  
Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> wrote:  
>In article <382a72\$ena@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael  
Mancini) writes:  
>>Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> wrote:  
>>>Excellent point. \*\*\*But how does knowledge of Morse Code have anything to do  
>>>with not abusing the spectrum?\*\*\*  
>>  
>>Something earned through sacrifice is valued much more than something  
>>unearned.  
>  
>Fine. Assuming we grant you that point (but I don't) for the sake  
>of argument, why should that "sacrifice" be the mechanical conditioning  
>of the nervous system to decode manual Morse? Wouldn't a different  
>sacrifice be just as good, say climbing a 300 foot tower 10 times in  
>one day to install a packet repeater system, for example? Or digging  
>trenches for 120 radials? Or something else more useful to amateur  
>radio pursuits? Why manual Morse? Because \*you\* had to do it? Please  
>answer the question.

Some people choose to work for a living, while others are satisfied  
living on welfare. Why do I mention this? Because I feel it demonstrates  
an important parallel. There are those of us who have earned our ticket  
through sacrifice and hard work, and now there appears to be a movement  
of Amateurs, Amateur-Wannabes, and Codeless Technicians who feel that  
the last remaining element of Amateur examinations which requires  
effort to pass should be eliminated. I see no need for laziness to be  
rewarded by the issuance of an Amateur license.

-----  
Date: Fri, 21 Oct 94 21:56:56 -0500  
From: Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>

References<1994Oct17.130400.2817@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> <Cxu0sq.9qq@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<1994Oct21.134310.22891@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> writes:

>No, during the code test free Tech filings, the issue of code test  
>free access to HF didn't even come up. There weren't any formal  
>comments at all on that subject. To have a chance of success, such  
>a filing must wait until we resolve the WARC issues.

The "WARC issues" can be settled by a Presidential order. We aren't ruled by  
the  
UN.

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #501

\*\*\*\*\*